

Appl. No. 10/678,549  
Amdt. dated October 8, 2004  
Reply to Office action of July 26, 2004,

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed July 26, 2004.

The Examiner rejected claims 16-23 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting, stating that each of claims 16-23 is obvious in light of independent claim 1 of applicant's prior U.S. Patent No. 5,345,170. Enclosed is a terminal disclaimer that overcomes the Examiner's rejection.

The Examiner indicated that some of the references cited in applicant's prior PTO-1449 submission were not considered because copies of those references were not found in the file of prior U.S. Application No. 10/274,068. An additional PTO-1449 form has been submitted listing each of these non-considered references, with copies of each reference also submitted.

In view of the foregoing remarks and the enclosed terminal disclaimer, the applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of claims 16-23.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Kurt Rohlf  
Reg. No. 54,405  
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631